

1 WO
2
3
4
5

6 **IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
7 **FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA**

8
9 Center for Biological Diversity, et al.,
10 Plaintiffs,
11 v.
12 United States Forest Service, et al.,
13 Defendants.

No. CV-24-0031-PHX-JAT

ORDER

15 Defendants move for clarification inquiring whether Local Rule 7.2(g) applies to
16 Plaintiffs' pending motion. Plaintiffs' motion was filed pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil
17 Procedure 59. (Doc. 47).

18 In this Court's opinion, Local Rule Civil 7.2(g) applies only to interlocutory orders,
19 not final orders.

20 LRCiv 7.2(g) governs motions for reconsideration of interlocutory
21 orders. *See Motorola, Inc. v. J.B. Rodgers Mech. Contractors*, 215 F.R.D.
22 581, 582–83 (D. Ariz. 2003); *see also Equal Employment Opportunity*
23 *Comm'n v. Gala AZ Holdings, Inc.*, No. CV 11-00383-PHX-JAT, 2012 WL
24 3704697, at *1 n.1 (D. Ariz. Aug. 28, 2012) (noting that the Court applies
the standard set forth in *Motorola, Inc. v. J.B. Rodgers Mech. Contractors* to
non-appealable, interlocutory orders, but applies the standard set forth in
Rule 59 to appealable orders).

25 *Kaufman v. Warner Bros. Ent. Inc.*, No. CV-16-02248-PHX-JAT, 2019 WL 1150953, at
26 *2 (D. Ariz. Mar. 13, 2019); *see also Parker v. Arizona*, No. CV-17-00887-PHX-DWL,
27 2019 WL 2579404, at *2 (D. Ariz. June 24, 2019) (applying the same conclusion).

28 Here, the Order at issue was final and a judgment was entered. Therefore, this Court
will not apply Local Rule Civil 7.2(g).

1 || Based on the foregoing,

2 **IT IS ORDERED** that the motion for clarification (Doc. 48) is granted to the extent
3 specified above.

4 Dated this 27th day of September, 2024.


James A. Teilborg
Senior United States District Judge